REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 9, 2006 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claim 1 has been amended and claims 4-12, 15-18 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowability of Claims 19-25 and 27

The Applicants note with appreciation the indication at page 5 of the Office Action that claims 19-25 and 27 are allowed.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 15-18 and 28

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 15-18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kumar et al. (Patent No. 6,237,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the additional features of dependent claim 8. Thus, claim 1 presently has the same scope as previously-presented dependent claim 8 (now canceled). Claim 1 therefore presently recites the features of "wherein a memory controller associated with the first memory device terminates the memory request in response to the termination request." The Office Action asserts that this feature is disclosed by Kumar at col. 4, lines 33-35. *See Office Action*, p.3. This cited passage states: "If, however, one or more of the subsequent memory levels process the memory request before it can be dequeued, then the retrieved information will be ignored by the control logic of the queues that receive the information." *Kumar*, col. 4, lines 33-35. Thus, the cited passage of Kumar discloses aborting a memory request or ignoring retrieved information by control logic of the queues that receive the information. However, as illustrated by FIG. 1 of Kumar, the memory controller 110 of Kumar is separate from the control logic of the queues (i.e., 145, 142, 165 and 168) of Kumar. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the queues of Kumar are not a memory controller, nor are they the equivalent to a memory controller. Thus, Kumar fails to disclose or suggest that it is a memory controller that terminates the memory request.

Accordingly, Kumar fails to disclose at least one feature recited by Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 therefore is respectfully submitted.

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 6

At page 5 of the Office Action, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating this rejection.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, L.L.P.
5914 West Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

6 October 2006
Date

Page 7 of 7   U.S. App. No.: 09/963,861

PAGE 9/9 * RCVD AT 10/6/2006 2:36:52 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/11 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 327 5452 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28